

indicate that only a small minority of businesses believe that congestion deteriorated. This finding supports previous research on operational impacts of access management techniques provided in the literature.

Even more pronounced is the perceived safety effect. Eighty-three percent (83%) of businesses along comparison corridors believed that safety would improve or stay the same, compared to 64% of businesses on treatment corridors. Although the perception of safety appeared to decrease following installation of the median, the majority of respondents did believe there were significant safety improvements. Like the operational effects, this mirrors prior research findings summarized in the literature.

Similarly, 44% of comparison respondents felt that a median installation would increase or have no change in the number of customers per day, while 58% of treatment site respondents indicated that the number of customers actually increased or stayed the same. These results suggest a shift in perception between comparison and treatment sites and may indicate that some negative preconceptions of median impact on sales may not have been well-founded.

Customer satisfaction with access to the store was also surveyed. Seventy-one percent (71%) of businesses at comparison sites thought that access to the store would get worse, while businesses at treatment sites said 53% of customers indicated access was worse. This is an important question because the perception of business owners in the comparison group represents a population subset similar to that of business owners that go to public meetings. This finding says that business owner's perception of customer accessibility improved. Also, looking at treatment sites only, an equal split of better and no change versus worse access is shown. This generally means that there was basically no perceived change from before to after median installation.